DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 014 CS 503 336

AUTHOR Prisbell, Marshall
TITLE Correlates of Interpersonal Attraction.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Chicago, IL, April 9-11, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Communication Research; *Interpersonal Attraction; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Positive Reinforcement; *Predictor Variables; *Security (Psychology); Self Reward; Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

A study assessed the relationship of the independent variables of interpersonal attraction to the dependent variables of feeling good, relational safety, and uncertainty level. Subjects were 75 elementary and secondary school teachers, 61 communication students, 18 child development professionals, and 8 service club members. Each subject completed scales measuring interpersonal attraction, uncertainty level, feeling good, and safety with a randomly assigned target person in mind. The results showed that social attraction had a moderately high independent predictive power concerning uncertainty level, safety, and feeling good. Physical and task attraction also contributed significant variance to those measures. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201014

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Correlates of Interpersonal Attraction

Marshall Prisbell

Department of Speech Communication
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588
(402) 472-3348

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marshall Prisbell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

This investigation assessed the relationship of the independent variables of interpersonal attraction to the dependent variables of: (1) feeling good, (2) relational safety, and (3) uncertainty level.

Results indicated that social attraction has moderately-high independent predictive power concerning uncertainty level, safety, and feeling good. Physical and task attraction also contributed significant unique variance to those criterion measures. Directions for future attraction were also discussed.

Top 4 Program:
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association convention, Chicago, 1981.

CS503336

Correlates of Interpersonal Attraction

A major interest for communication researchers has been to investigate those variables which potentially predict relationship maintenance. In particular, the construct interpersonal attraction has been considered a primary motivating factor in the development and escalation of interpersonal relationships. Numerous social psychological scholars have previously noted the importance and nature of attraction in the dyadic setting (Heider, 1946; Newcomb, 1961, 1963; Thibaut & Kelly, 1959; Byrne, 1971; Berscheid & Walster, 1978; Huston, 1974). Even in the communication discipline many researchers have investigated and assessed the relationship between attraction and other interpersonal variables (McCroskey & McCain, 1972; Clatterbuck, 1979; Prisbell, 1980; Berger, 1973; Berger, Munley, & Clatterbuck, 1976; Berger & Clatterbuck, 1976; McCroskey & Richmond, 1979). Although attraction research seems in abundance, there still remain many unanswered questions revolving around this construct. The purpose of this study is to further explore the correlates of interpersonal attraction. Three variables are worth consideration: (1) uncertainty level, (2) feeling good, and (3) relational safety. It is proposed that these states are a result of interpersonal attraction.

Interpersonal Attraction

Many conceptualizations of attraction have been posited and are worth noting in this report. For instance, Byrne (1971) conceptualized attraction as the management of rewards. Further, Byrne (1971) claimed that attraction between individuals was a function of the extent to which the interactants could reciprocally provide rewards. On a more

simplistic level, Berscheid and Walster (1978) suggested that interpersonal attraction was a positive attitude toward another. They (1978) contended that attraction can be defined as ". . . an individual's tendency or predisposition to evaluate another person or the symbol of the person in a positive (or negative) way" (Berscheid & Walster, 1978, p. 3-4). The above conceptualizations treated attraction as a unidimensional construct. Other researchers have demonstrated that attraction is multidimensional in nature. Specifically, McCroskey and McCain (1972) demonstrated that attraction was composed of three dimensions: social, physical, and task.

Interpersonal attraction has been demonstrated to have a major role in the formation of dyadic relationships as well as operating throughout the life span of the relationship. Attraction produces a continuing process of reciprocated interactions which helps to maintain and develop the relationship (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Knapp, 1978). Byrne (1971) suggests that the more individuals are attracted to one another, the more they will communicate with each other. In addition, McCroskey and Wheeless (1976) state, "we choose to interact with those to whom we are attracted" (p. 146). Therefore, one can conclude that interpersonal attraction plays an important role in the development of ongoing interactions within an existing dyad.

Previous research has demonstrated that attraction leads to frequent, continuing interactions. Thus, it is these "continuing interactions" which facilitate the growth of attraction and its consequences (e.g., feeling good, safety, and uncertainty level).

Feeling Good

Feeling good is a potential correlate of interpersonal attraction. "Feeling good is a temporarily enhanced self-concept derived from peak experiences (Maslow, 1968), positive experiencing (Landsman, 1973) and overall rewarding interactions" (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979, p. 5). Measurement and further conceptual development for this construct are reported by Prisbell (1979).

Research indicates that individuals structure their interactions to derive feelings of self-worth (Festinger, 1954); Pettigrew, 1967; Merton, 1957; Rogers, 1959). Along similar lines, evidence suggests that we tend to be attracted to those who cooperate with us in our attempts to obtain rewards for ourselves (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963; Goranson & Berkowitz, 1966). Lott and Lott (1974) also contend that individuals are attracted to those who are present at the time of reward and not attracted to those present at the time of punishment. This reward is based on one individual increasing another individual's self-concept, thus creating attraction on the part of one dyad member to another. One can conclude that people are attracted to those who are reinforcing and provide rewarding stimuli (Byrne & Clore, 1970). This rewarding stimuli arouses positive feelings in the individual, thus temporarily heightening one's self-image. This rationale leads to the examination of the following hypothesis:

H1: A linear combination of interpersonal attraction variables is significantly related to feeling good.

Relational Safety

A second correlate of interpersonal attraction is that of relational

safety. Safety is conceptualized as describing a relationship which is safe, secure, straightforward, non-threatening, and logical. In previous research, safety has been studied as the behaviors and outcomes manifested in the concept trust. Scott and Powers (1978) define trust as, "A special kind of expectancy about the probability of another person, who is in control of the risks we take, minimizing them for us" (p. 181). A more encompassing conceptualization of interpersonal trust is, "a process of engaging in certain types of dependent behaviors which are related to favorable perceptions of the trustworthiness of another person (or people in general) in somewhat risky situations where the expected outcomes that are dependent upon other person(s) are not known with certainty" (Wheeless, 1978, p. 143-144). To date, the differentiation in meaning of safety-trust is not well documented, although there has been research exploring the nature of safety in interpersonal relationships. For instance, perceived homophily was found to be a good predictor of relational safety, accounting for 46 percent of the variance (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979). Safety was also found to be a significant criterial attribute of interpersonal solidarity, correlated at .78, as well as accounting for 65 percent of the variance in solidarity when combined with self-disclosure variables (Prisbell, 1980). Finally, relationship-type was significantly related to safety. People perceive safety differently in relationships of friends, intimates, casual acquaintances, and business/professionals (Prisbell & Dallinger, 1980). This investigation examines the relationship between interpersonal attraction and safety.

To date, no research could be found linking interpersonal attraction

to relational safety or trust, although one can conclude from previous attraction research that individuals tend to be attracted to those who are rewarding and/or reinforcing (C.F., Berscheid & Walster, 1978). If we remain attracted to those who provide us rewards and we continue to interact with those others, then some form of safety-trust must be operating in the relationship. Thus, it seems reasonable to believe that safety in the relationship is an outcome of being attracted to those rewarding others. Therefore, the following hypothesis was examined:

> H2: A linear combination of interpersonal attraction variables is significantly related to relational safety.

Uncertainty Level

Uncertainty is employed by Berger and Calabrese (1975) to mean the degree of confidence an individual feels about his/her own ability to explain retroactively or predict proactively a co-interactant's behavior (Lester, 1978). Working from the assumption that uncertainty can be employed to explain relationship development, Berger and Calabrese (1975) advanced a series of axioms linking uncertainty to a number of other constructs. Of concern to this report is axiom 7 which suggests an inverse relationship between uncertainty level and attraction. Clatterbuck (1979) suggests that, "a modest but positive relationship exists between attraction and attributional confidence" (p. 154). Three different instruments were used to measure attraction including the McCroskey and McCain (1972) scale. However, the three dimensions of attraction as previously reported by McCroskey and McCain (1972) were

not analyzed independently by Clatterbuck (1979). This investigation treated interpersonal attraction as a multidimensional construct regarding the simultaneous model as well as the overall R^2. Thus, the following hypothesis was examined:

> H3: A linear combination of interpersonal attraction variables is significantly related to uncertainty level.

Furthermore, there is reason to believe that moderate relationships exist among the variables uncertainty level, safety, and feeling good. These variables seem to be operative simultaneously in an ongoing interpersonal relationship. Thus, when these variables are taken together they would seem to have greater predictive power than when taken independently to that of the interpersonal attraction variables. Therefore, the following hypothesis was also considered:

> H4: A linear combination of interpersonal attraction variables is significantly related to a linear combination of feeling good, safety, and uncertainty level variables.

METHODS

Subject Sample

The sample for this investigation included 162 subjects consisting of elementary and secondary education teachers (N=75), communication students (N=61), child-development professionals (N=18), and Lion's Club members (N=8). These four subject samples were chosen for two reasons: (1) samples of adult subjects were preferred since it was assumed that older people would have more previous relationship experience, and (2) sample diversity was preferred since this would

enhance generalizability of results.

Criteria for Scale Validation

Most scales were validated with three different but concurrent statistical considerations: item-total correlations, internal reliability estimates, and factor analyses. Item-total correlations were not computed for the interpersonal attraction scales.

For all factor analyses an eigenvalue of 1.0 was established as a guideline for the extraction of an additional factor and the Scree procedure was employed in order to determine the number of "valid" factors present within the eigenvalue of 1.0 guideline (Cattell, 1965). In all oblique factor analyses performed in this investigation, a factor was considered meaningful if two or more items loaded on that factor above .40 and the factor loading accounted for twice the variance of any secondary loadings. In all unrotated factor analyses performed, a unidimensional factor was considered meaningful if all items used in the scale on the unrotated first factor were above .40 and if the factor loading on the first factor accounted for twice the variance of the other factors. Additionally, an item was required to have a .45 correlation with the total score to be considered part of the scale. Increased internal reliability was the ultimate consideration for determining factor structure in that any items which decreased reliabilities would be deleted from the scale. Reliabilities for each instrument were computed utilizing the Spearman-Brown (odd-even) and Nunnally formulas (Wood, 1960; Nunnally, 1967, 193-194).[1] Dimensional structures consistent with conceptualization were sought but all other

statistically meaningful structures were examined. Items failing to meet statistical criteria and not constituting another viable factor would be deleted.

Operationalizations of Variables Under Study

Interpersonal Attraction

Interpersonal attraction was measured with a 12-item, seven interval, Likert-type instrument developed by McCroskey and McCain (1972) (See Appendix A). Oblique factor analysis produced a viable three-factor solution as previously reported by McCroskey and McCain (1972): social attraction, task attraction, and physical attraction (see Table 1 for factor loadings). Reliabilities using Nunnally's (1967) internal reliability formula on each dimension of the interpersonal attraction measure were the following: social attraction = .86, task attraction = .79, and physical attraction = .88 (see Table 2 for scale summary statistics).

Feeling Good

Feeling good was measured with a 14-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type instrument (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979) (see Appendix B). Factor analysis of the feeling good instrument produced an unrotated unidimensional solution (see Table 4 for factor loadings) with no loading under .70 on the first factor. Only one factor had an eigenvalue above 1.0 and the one factor solution accounted for 72 percent of the variance of the items. Split-half internal reliability of .96 was computed (see Table 2 for scale summary statistics and Table 3 for item-total correlations).

Safety

Safety was measured with an 11-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type instrument (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979) (see Appendix B). Factor analysis of the safety instrument produced an unrotated unidimensional solution (see Table 5 for factor loadings) with all items loading above .55, accounting for 58% of the variance in the items. Split-half reliability of .90 was computed for the instrument (see Table 2 for scale summary statistics and Table 3 for item-total correlations).

Uncertainty Level

Uncertainty level was measured with a 10-item, seven-interval, Likert-type instrument (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979) (see Appendix A). Subjects were asked to indicate how certain/knowledgeable they were about the designated target-person, in areas of behaviors, emotional states, feelings and interests.

Factor analysis of the uncertainty level instrument produced an unrotated unidimensional solution (see Table 6 for factor loadings) with all items loading above .74 on the first factor except one item which loaded .51. Reliability for the instrument was .92 (see Table 2 for scale summary statistics and Table 3 for item-total correlations).

Procedures

All subjects received a research packet containing scales measuring interpersonal attraction, uncertainty level, feeling good, and safety. Additional measures were included in the packet but were not examined in the present study. Subjects completed the scales with a randomly

assigned target person in mind. Fourteen target-persons were selected on the basis of their potential closeness or social distance from the subjects.[2] All completed packets were returned anonymously through the mail, except for the student sample which was returned anonymously to the instructor.

Statistical Analysis

Hypothesis 1 was tested by means of multiple regression analysis, with interpersonal attraction as the predictor variables and feeling good as the criterion variable. Hypothesis 2 was tested by means of multiple regression analysis, with interpersonal attraction as the predictor variables and safety as the criterion variable. Hypothesis 3 was also tested by means of multiple regression analysis, with interpersonal attraction as the predictor variables and uncertainty level as the criterion variable. Finally, Hypothesis 4 was tested by a canonical correlation analysis as suggested by Levine (1977). The three dimensions of interpersonal attraction comprised one canonical variate and uncertainty level, safety, and feeling good comprised the other canonical variate. The alpha level for all significance tests was set at .05. Additionally, for those R^2's which were significantly different from zero ($p < .05$) power was assessed[3] (Cohen & Cohen, 1975).

Hypothesized Results

Hypothesis 1 was confirmed. Multiple regression analysis was computed for the predictor variables of interpersonal attraction to that of the criterion variable of feeling good. Interpersonal attraction accounted for 53 percent of the variance in feeling good ($F = 59.86$;

df = 3/158; $p < .0001$). Bivariate correlation analysis indicated that social attraction accounted for 45 percent of the variance in feeling good ($r = .67$), physical attraction accounted for 29 percent of the variance in feeling good ($r = .54$), and task attraction accounted for 25 percent of the variance in feeling good ($r = .50$) (see Table 7 for correlation matrix).

In order to determine unique variance for each of the interpersonal attraction dimensions, partial regression coefficients in the simultaneous model were examined. Social attraction accounted for 14 percent of the unique variance in feeling good ($F = 46.60$; df = 1/160; $p < .0001$), physical attraction accounted for 5 percent of the unique variance in feeling good ($F = 16.87$; df = 1/160; $p < .0001$), and task attraction accounted for 2 percent of the unique variance in feeling good ($F = 6.61$; df = 1/160; $p < .02$). Power was computed to be greater than .99 ($n = 160$; $K_B = 5$; $\alpha = .05$).

Hypothesis 2 was confirmed. Multiple regression analysis was computed for the predictor variables of interpersonal attraction and the criterion variable of safety. Interpersonal attraction accounted for 42 percent of the variance in safety ($F = 38.26$; df = 3/158; $p < .0001$). Bivariate correlation analysis demonstrated that social attraction accounted for 35 percent of the variance in safety ($r = .59$), physical attraction accounted for 23 percent of the variance in safety ($r = .48$), and task attraction accounted for 20 percent of the variance in safety ($r = .45$).

In addition, the partial regression coefficients in the simultaneous model were examined. Social attraction accounted for 10 percent of the

unique variance in safety ($F = 27.76$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .0001$), physical attraction accounted for 4 percent of the unique variance in safety ($F = 9.99$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .002$), and task attraction accounted for 2 percent of the unique variance in safety ($F = 5.29$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .03$). Power was computed to be greater than .99 ($n = 160$; $K_\beta = 5$; $\alpha = .05$).

Hypothesis 3 was confirmed. Multiple regression analysis was computed for the predictor variables of interpersonal attraction to that of the criterion variable of uncertainty level. Interpersonal attraction accounted for 32 percent of the variance in uncertainty level ($F = 24.38$; $df = 3/158$; $p < .0001$). Bivariate correlation analysis indicated that social attraction accounted for 25 percent of the variance in uncertainty level ($r = .50$), physical attraction accounted for 18 percent of the variance in uncertainty level ($r = .43$), and task attraction accounted for 19 percent of the variance in uncertainty level ($r = .44$).

The partial regression coefficients in the simultaneous model indicated three unique contributions to the overall model. Social attraction accounted for 5 percent of the unique variance in uncertainty level ($F = 12.40$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .001$), physical attraction accounted for 3 percent of the unique variance in uncertainty level ($F = 7.07$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .01$), and task attraction also accounted for 3 percent of the unique variance in uncertainty level ($F = 6.60$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .02$). Power was computed to be greater than .99 ($n = 160$; $K_\beta = 5$; $\alpha = .05$).

Finally, hypothesis 4 was confirmed. Canonical correlation analysis produced one significant canonical relationship ($Rc = .75$; $\chi^2 = 127.75$;

df = 9/147; $p < .0001$) between the predictor variables in group one: social attraction, physical attraction, and task attraction to the criterion variables of feeling good, safety, and uncertainty level in group two. The relationship between each of the first canonical variate is such that 56 percent of the variance of the first set can be explained by the second set and vice versa. The canonical coefficients for the variables of group one were: social attraction (.91), physical attraction (.74), and task attraction (.70). The canonical coefficients for the variables of group two were: feeling good (.98), safety (.86), and uncertainty level (.73) (see Table 8). The redundancy index showed that the interpersonal attraction variables accounted for 35 percent of the shared variance, while the uncertainty level, safety, and feeling good variables accounted for 41 percent of the shared variance.

DISCUSSION

This investigation demonstrates interpersonal attraction to be a meaningful predictor of uncertainty level, feeling good, and relational safety. Interpersonal attraction accounted for 53 percent of the variance in feeling good. More specifically, social attraction accounted for 14 percent of the unique variance in feeling good, physical attraction accounted for 5 percent of the unique variance in feeling good, and task attraction accounted for 2 percent of the unique variance in feeling good. One can conclude that individuals <u>feel good</u> about themselves when interacting with those whom they perceive as attractive. Further research needs to examine what the attraction is which makes

one have this sense of feeling good.

Interpersonal attraction was also a good predictor of safety in that it accounted for 42 percent of the variance in safety. Specifically, social attraction accounted for 10 percent of the unique variance in safety, physical attraction accounted for 4 percent of the unique variance in safety, and task attraction accounted for 2 percent of the unique variance in safety. This finding indicates that being socially attractive to another produces a feeling of safety. In addition, when individuals are physically and task attracted to one another, they also express a feeling of safety. However, these two variables accounted for much less unique variance in safety than social attraction. It seems that individuals perceive social attraction as a more salient factor in producing safety.

A third finding of this investigation indicated that interpersonal attraction was a good predictor of uncertainty level, accounting for 32 percent of the variance in uncertainty. More specifically, social attraction accounted for 5 percent of the unique variance in uncertainty, while physical and task attraction both accounted for 3 percent of the unique variance in uncertainty level. This finding is completely consistent with previous research (Clatterbuck, 1979). One can conclude that being attracted to other individuals produces low levels of uncertainty.

Finally, the interpersonal attraction variables accounted for 56 percent of the variance in the feeling good, safety, and uncertainty level variables. This finding indicates that, not only does attraction predict these variables independently, but predicts these variables in

a linear combination. Thus, feeling good, safety, and uncertainty level operate simultaneously in an interpersonal relationship.

Thus, this investigation appears to further validate the construct of interpersonal attraction. Attraction is a rather important concept in predicting specific consequences of an interpersonal relationship. Although attraction has been well explored in previous studies, future attraction research still needs to be conducted.

First, data should be collected repeatedly measuring individuals' perceptions over time. One needs to see how attraction operates during the entry phases of acquaintanceship as well as later stages of a continuing relationship (i.e., personal phase, exit phase). Researchers need to form dyads at a zero history point in order to capture the full breadth of the relationship. In addition, one would be able to verify if physical attraction plays a more salient role for the actors during initial acquaintance rather than social or task attraction. By utilizing repeated measure designs (Cook & Campbell, 1979), researchers would also be able to demonstrate if social attraction develops over time (i.e., personal phase) as well as task attraction. One would speculate that social attraction would significantly increase from measurement phase to measurement phase while physical attraction would not significantly increase over long periods of time.

Secondly, causal designs need to be utilized in determining the sequential nature of the variables operating in the relationship (e.g., cross log panel design, Kenny, 1975; path analysis, C.F., Borgatta, 1969). Cross log panel designs could be used to determine if, for instance, feeling good causes social attraction or vice versa. Also,

does safety cause social attraction or does being socially attractive to someone cause a feeling of safety? Path analysis could demonstrate the relationship among social and physical attraction and uncertainty level. For instance, one could argue that individuals meet initially because of physical attraction. This leads to a reciprocation of interactions which lowers uncertainty. As the relationship develops, physical attraction is no longer the primary motivator of relationship maintenance. Instead, social attraction motivates the dyad into escalation which further reduces uncertainty. These and other relationships can be examined with the use of such statistical techniques and designs.

A third consideration for researchers investigating interpersonal attraction is to directly manipulate attraction in order to examine potential perceptual differences. One could have brief "valid" descriptions of a socially attractive person and a socially non-attractive person, give the descriptions to S_s and have them complete the dependent measure(s). By manipulating the independent variable (e.g., attraction), one eliminates some method variance which is usually present when collecting both independent and dependent variable data at the same time and via self-report measures.

NOTES

1. Coefficients of internal reliability were computed using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula for split-half reliability (Wood, 1960), and Nunnally (1960) formula 6-18. Nunnally's formula

$$r_{kk} = \frac{\Sigma rij}{1 + (K-1)rij}$$

is computed by taking the average correlation among all items in a measure multiplied by the number of items in the measure, divided by 1 plus the number of items minus one, times the average correlation. Pearson product-moment correlations are transformed to Z scores before summing in the average step, and the average Z score is then transformed back to the equivalent average Pearson product-moment correlation before use in Nunnally's formula (Nunnally, 1967, pp. 193-194).

2. The six closer targer-persons were the following: (1) best male friend; (2) best female friend; (3) boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse; (4) father/mother; (5) brother/sister; and (6) co-worker.

The eight more distant target-persons were the following: (1) an acquaintance through an organization; (2) parent of one of your child's best friends; (3) supervisor/boss; (4) neighbor; (5) disliked person; (6) subordinate; (7) minister/priest/rabbi; and (8) doctor.

Many of the closer targets include those used by Jourard (1964, 1971) in his research or were suggested by Brown (1965, p. 58) as persons with whom we are more likely to have solidarity. The more distant targets included a number of persons whose social roles

encourage disclosure from others. In addition, an attempt was made to avoid highly distant sources that would be unrealistic for validating the concept of self-disclosure (e.g., the President, the Pope, etc.).

3. Power was assessed as a function of the N utilized in the study, the obtained effect size - $F^2 = \frac{R^2}{1-R^2}$ derived by dividing the multiple R^2 by $1 - R^2$, and the alpha value of the obtained R^2. Power is computed using the following formula: $L = F^2 (N - K - 1)$ and then an L table is utilized by finding the L value corresponding to the number of independent variables and reading the obtained power (Cohen & Cohen, 1975).

REFERENCES

Berger, C. R. Task performance and attributional communication as determinants of interpersonal attraction. Speech Monographs, 1973, 40, 280-286.

Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 99-112.

Berger, C. R., & Clatterbuck, G. W. Attitude similarity and attributional information as determinants of uncertainty reduction and interpersonal attraction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association convention, Portland, 1976.

Berger, C. R., Munley, M. E., and Clatterbuck, G. W. Uncertainty, similarity and attraction: When is to know him to love him? Paper presented at the annual Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, 1976.

Berowitz, L., & Daniels, L. R. Responsibility and dependency. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 429-436.

Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. H. Interpersonal attraction. 2nd edition, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1978.

Borgatta, E. (Ed.). Sociological Methodology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Byrne, D. The attraction paradigm. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Byrne, D., & Clore, G. L. A reinforcement model of evaluative responses. Personality: An International Journal, 1970, 1, 103-128.

Cattell, R. B. Factor analysis: An introduction to essentials. Biometrics, 1965, 21, 405-435.

Clatterbuck, G. W. Attributional confidence and uncertainty in initial interaction. Human Communication Research, 1979, 5, 147-157.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Pub., 1975.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1979.

Festinger, L. A. A theory of social comparison. Human Relations, 1954, 14, 48-61.

Goranson, R. E., & Berkowitz, L. Reciprocity and responsibility reactions to prior help. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 227-232.

Heider, F. Attitudes and cognitive organization. Journal of Psychology, 1946, 21, 107-112.

Huston, T. L. (Ed.). Foundations of interpersonal attraction. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Kenny, P. A. Cross-logged panel correlations: a test for spuriousness. Psychological Bulletin, 1975, 82, 887-903.

Landsman, T. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, 1973. In Jourard, S. M., Healthy personality, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1974.

Lester, R. E. Beyond initial interaction: Dyadic communication behavior and uncertainty reduction in personal phase relationships. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association convention, Chicago, 1978.

Levine, M. S. Canonical analysis and factor comparison. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.

Lott, A. J. & Lott, B. E. The role of reward in the formation of positive interpersonal attitudes. In Huston, T. L. (Ed.). Foundations of interpersonal attraction. New York: Academic Press, 1974, 171-189.

Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being, 2nd edition. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1968.

Merton, R. Social theory and social structure (revised edition). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

McCroskey, J. C. & McCain, T. A. The measurement of interpersonal attraction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication convention, Honolulu, 1972.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. The reliability and validity of scales for the measurement of interpersonal attraction and homophily. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia, 1979.

Newcomb, T. M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1961.

Newcomb, T. M. Stability underlying changes in interpersonal attraction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 376-386.

Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Pettigrew, T. Social evaluation theory: Convergence and applications. In Levine, D. (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1967, 15, 241-311.

Prisbell, M. Feeling good: Conceptualization and measurement. Paper contributed to the annual Western Speech Communication Association convention, Los Angeles, 1979.

Prisbell, M. Criterial attributes of interpersonal solidarity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association convention, Portland, 1980.

Prisbell, M. The nature of safety, self-disclosure, uncertainty level, and solidarity in interpersonal relationships. Unpublished manuscript, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1980.

Prisbell, M., & Andersen, J. F. The importance of perceived homophily,

uncertainty reduction, feeling good, safety, and self-disclosure in interpersonal relationships. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association convention, San Antonio, 1979.

Prisbell, M., & Dallinger, J. Interpersonal perceptions and relationship-types. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association convention, New York City, 1980.

Rogers, C. Therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships. In Koch, S. (ed.), Psychology: A study of science. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Scott, M. D., & Powers, W. G. Interpersonal communication: A question of needs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.

Thibaut, J. W., and Kelly, H. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1959.

Wheeless, L. R. A follow-up study of the relationships among trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. Human Communication Research, 1979, 4, 143-157.

Wood, D. A. Test construction. Columbus: Merrill, 1960.

Appendix A

Interpersonal Attraction Measure

This set of scales is composed of 12 statements regarding your feelings about the individual circled on the first page. Indicate the degree to which these statements reflect your feelings about the individual by marking whether you: 7 strongly agree, 6 agree, 5 moderately agree, 4 are undecided, 3 moderately disagree, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree. Mark the appropriate number of your response in the space provided.

I think s(he) could be a friend of mine.

It would be difficult to meet and talk with him/her.

S(he) just wouldn't fit into my circle of friends.

We could never establish a personal friendship with each other.

I think s(he) is quite handsome (pretty).

S(he) is very sexy looking.

I find him/her very attractive physically.

I don't like the way s(he) looks.

S(he) would be a typical goof-off when assigned a job to do.

I have confidence in his/her ability to get the job done.

If I wanted to get things done I could probably depend on him/her.

I couldn't get anything accomplished with him/her.

Uncertainty Level Measure

Please fill out the following scale to indicate how certain/knowledgeable you are about the designated person.

How well can you predict this person's behavior?
Extremely well :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Not at all

How well do you know this person?
Not at all :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Extremely well

How well can you predict this person's emotional states?
Extremely well :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Not at all

How well do you understand this person's feelings?
Extremely well :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Not at all

How well can you predict this person's decisions?
Extremely well :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Not at all

How well do you know this person's interests?
Not at all :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Extremely well

How well can you predict this person's attitudes/values?
Not at all :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Extremely well

How well do you know this person's likes/dislikes?
Not at all :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Extremely well

How well do you understand this person's judgements?
Extremely well :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Not at all

How well can you predict this person's responses?
Not at all :__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Extremely well

Appendix B

Relational Safety Instrument

Please check the appropriate space on each item which you think best describes the nature of the relationship between you and the designated person.

safe	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unsafe
irrational	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	rational
insecure	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	secure
sure	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unsure
vulnerable	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	invulnerable
threatened	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unthreatened
straightforward	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	tricky
not deceptive	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	deceptive
restricted	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	not restricted
logical	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	illogical
able to be harmed	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	not able to be harmed

State Feeling Good Measure

Please check the appropriate space on each item to best reflect how you feel about yourself when you are relating to the designated person.

good	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	bad
valuable	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	worthless
positive	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	negative
admirable	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	deplorable
happy	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	sad
gloomy	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	cheerful
unpleasant	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	pleasant
interesting	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	uninteresting
satisfied	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unsatisfied
attractive	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unattractive
confident	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	not confident
exuberant	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	repressed
capable	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	incapable
heightened	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	reduced

Table 1

Rotated Oblique Factor Matrix
For Three-Factor Solution Interpersonal Attraction

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	.62	-.46	-.82
Item 2	-.43	.22	.83
Item 3	-.21	.44	.80
Item 4	-.42	.41	.89
Item 5	.36	-.90	-.34
Item 6	.22	-.89	-.36
Item 7	.29	-.88	-.38
Item 8	-.48	.72	.55
Item 9	-.65	.12	.19
Item 10	.82	-.29	-.34
Item 11	.88	-.40	-.53
Item 12	-.71	.35	.55

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Eigenvalues	5.44	1.74	1.27
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.45	.60	.70

Interfactor Correlations

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Factor 1	1.000	-.348	-.474
Factor 2	-.348	1.000	.436
Factor 3	-.474	.436	1.000

Table 2

Scale Summary Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Internal Reliability
Physical Attraction	162	19.58	5.55	.88
Social Attraction	162	23.33	5.48	.86
Task Attraction	162	24.82	4.04	.79
Feeling Good	162	80.99	15.75	.96
Uncertainty Level	162	53.56	11.90	.92
Safety	162	58.89	11.52	.90

Table 3

Item-Total Correlation Coefficients

Safety		Uncertainty Level		Feeling Good	
Item 1	-.84	Item 1	-.74	Item 1	-.87
Item 2	.81	Item 2	.74	Item 2	-.86
Item 3	.88	Item 3	-.79	Item 3	-.89
Item 4	-.85	Item 4	-.82	Item 4	-.83
Item 5	.38	Item 5	-.81	Item 5	-.90
Item 6	.75	Item 6	.84	Item 6	.88
Item 7	-.81	Item 7	.76	Item 7	.91
Item 8	-.69	Item 8	.83	Item 8	-.75
Item 9	.64	Item 9	-.54	Item 9	-.88
Item 10	-.73	Item 10	.78	Item 10	-.71
Item 11	.67			Item 11	-.85
				Item 12	-.85
				Item 13	-.82
				Item 14	-.85

Table 4

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
For Two-Factor Solution Feeling Good

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.87	-.19
Item 2	.86	.07
Item 3	.90	-.17
Item 4	.83	-.21
Item 5	.90	-.22
Item 6	-.88	.20
Item 7	-.91	.17
Item 8	.74	.33
Item 9	.88	-.03
Item 10	.70	.55
Item 11	.82	.32
Item 12	.84	.09
Item 13	.82	.10
Item 14	.85	-.07

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	10.03	.78
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.72	.77

Table 5

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Safety

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.88	-.04
Item 2	.84	-.02
Item 3	.90	.10
Item 4	-.87	-.06
Item 5	.56	.55
Item 6	.77	.27
Item 7	-.82	.27
Item 8	-.66	.45
Item 9	.61	.28
Item 10	-.73	.42
Item 11	.64	-.04

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	6.37	.92
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.58	.66

Table 6

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Uncertainty Level

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.76	.28
Item 2	.75	-.15
Item 3	-.80	.37
Item 4	-.82	.22
Item 5	-.82	.27
Item 6	.83	.39
Item 7	.76	.50
Item 8	.83	.40
Item 9	-.51	.44
Item 10	.78	.28
	Factor 1	**Factor 2**
Eigenvalues	5.94	1.20
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.59	.71

Table 7

Correlation Matrix

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Social Attraction (1)	--	.49	.52	.50	.67	.59
Physical Attraction (2)		--	.40	.43	.54	.48
Task Attraction (3)			--	.44	.50	.45
Uncertainty Level (4)				--	.62	.59
Feeling Good (5)					--	.76
Safety (6)						--

All variables statistically significant at .05 level, $p < .05$.

Table 8

Canonical Correlations

Canonical Variables	Canonical Correlations	Chi-Square	DF	Prob Chi-Square
1	.75	127.75	9	.0001
2	.08	.95	4	.92
3	.01	.02	1	.89

Correlation Coefficients Between Each Canonical Variable of Group 1

Canonical	Social Attraction	Physical Attraction	Task Attraction
Var. #1	.91	.74	.70
Var. #2	-.26	-.03	.69
Var. #3	-.31	.68	-.18

Correlation Coefficients Between Each Canonical Variable of Group 2

Canonical	Feeling Good	Safety	Uncertainty Level
Var. #1	.98	.86	.73
Var. #2	-.16	.04	.67
Var. #3	.13	-.51	.13